

be the Department of Commerce, I am uncertain. But, I am certain that, until savings can be verified and functions and programs are properly studied, we should not haphazardly act or unsuitably connect the issue to the debt ceiling.

DR. TOM CLARK AND HIS HONORABLE CAREER OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, for the past three decades the city of Long Beach has benefited from the efforts of an extraordinary public servant, Dr. Thomas Clark, whose commitment and dedication have been integral to the city's development and growth over those years.

Tom Clark, whom I am privileged to call a friend, has been described as "a living piece of Long Beach history" in a recent article in the Long Beach Press Telegram. He was first elected to the Long Beach City Council in 1966, and his list of achievements is considerable. As the Press Telegram reported, "Clark pushed for a measure to put fluoride in the city's water supply, sponsored legislation that led to the construction of the Main Library and El Dorado Park and even rode aboard the Queen Mary when the historic ocean liner first sailed into Long Beach."

When Tom Clark announced that he would not seek reelection, it indeed signaled an end of an era. In addition to his three decades on the Council, Tom served two terms as the city's mayor, spending a total of 7 years in that position. He and his helpful wife, Lois, who is a professional medical librarian, have spent thousands of hours representing Long Beach throughout the city and State, as well as nationally and abroad. And his leadership extended well beyond the city, ranging from the California League of Cities to the California Public Employees Retirement System.

Tom exemplifies the best of what we seek in public service. The same days that he was spending countless hours in service to his fellow citizens as a member of the council, he was also working full-time as an optometrist, a practice from which he retired in 1993.

In a November 8 editorial, the Press Telegram said this of Tom Clark: "Clark is the very model of a city councilman. He is earnest to the point of gravity; almost never raises his voice; thrives on meetings and compromise; relishes the role of public official; has only a moderately thin skin; is only modestly partisan; never seems to tire of solving neighborhood problems; and has served long and loyally for little pay. What more could we ask?"

Tom Clark has regularly walked his council district. With a listed telephone, he was available to his constituents all times of night and day.

Tom can take pride in his accomplishments and the legacy he has left. He will be missed on the council, but I am confident that he will always be available to serve the city he loves and has done so much to improve.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Clark has conducted himself with honor. As citizen and office holder, he has symbolized good government and de-

cency, not only in the eyes of his friends and neighbors, but also to all who have known him.

I ask that the Press Telegram editorial be placed at this point in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

[From the Long Beach Press-Telegram, Nov. 8, 1995]

AN ARCHETYPICAL COUNCILMAN

It's a bit early to say goodbye to Tom Clark, because he plans to finish out his term before he retires as a Long Beach city councilman. But a few kind words are timely, and he deserves them.

Clark is the very model of a city councilman. He is earnest to the point of gravity; almost never raises his voice; thrives on meetings and compromise; relishes the role of public official; has only a moderately thin skin; is only modestly partisan; never seems to tire of solving neighborhood problems; and has served long and loyally for little pay.

What more could we ask? (Actually, if we could, we'd change his position on one or two things, but that's a different subject.) Agree with him or not, he stood for what he believed was best for his district and his community.

As the longest-serving of his city's public officials, Clark has been associated, for better or worse, directly or indirectly, with a long list of public works and community change; a performing arts center, downtown redevelopment, creation of El Dorado Park and the purchase of the Queen Mary (he rode it into town on its last voyage, and never abandoned ship, so to speak).

He has taken some flack now and then, most recently for his support of reviewing the Los Altos Shopping Center (a difficult and important task, and one that could not possibly please everyone). But he seems to have created no real enemies.

Clark's most intense political opponent was former Mayor Ernie Kell. Neither Clark nor Kell missed many opportunities to take a shot at each other, mostly on the somewhat foggy issue of leadership, and each regarded the other as an easy target; yet both managed to keep their differences on a mostly civil level. Clark lost a close election to Kell for mayor at large, but in the end he outlasted him and at least in that sense will have the last word.

For years Clark was the best known of Long Beach officials. He served twice as mayor at a time when that position was filled by council members, and he so enjoyed city governance that in his spare time he served as a leader of the association of local elected officials, the California League of Cities. Even now he probably wouldn't be stepping aside if he felt there was no one properly qualified to take his place.

But, after all these years, he is retiring. Because he served for such a long time—nearly a third of the history of his city, it is hard to say what might be his most significant accomplishment. Maybe it is pretty much what the League of Cities might expect, or the charter of a council-manager municipal government might suggest: a citizen, gainfully employed, who dedicates himself to elective office, part-time, representing no special interest other than his constituents, whom he serves honorably. As for what was most important to him, it's probably best, as it nearly always was, to take him at his word: that he wants to be remembered as someone who cared.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes 788 and 789 due to mechanical problems with my flight to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, had I not been detained, I would have voted "No" on rollcall vote 788 and "Yes" on rollcall vote 789.

"DOLE'S MOMENT"

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following column by James Glassman from the Washington Post to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1995]

DOLE'S MOMENT

(By James K. Glassman)

For two good reasons, Bob Dole's campaign people liked having Colin Powell around. First, Powell took the spotlight off Dole, letting him avoid the scrutiny that often destroys early front-runners. Second, Powell took the spotlight off the other candidates, depriving them of the publicity they needed to raise money and get traction.

Now Powell is gone, and the predictable stories have begun. The front page of The Post yesterday carried the headline: "Out in Front, but Losing Ground. Polls Expose Dole's Potential Vulnerabilities as Presidential Challenger." The New York Times opted for a piece on how "Moderates could pass up Dole and hold out for an independent." Etc. etc.

The hyperactive press demands novelty. It will never heed Pascal's famous warning "that all human evil comes from . . . man's being unable to sit still in a room." And, certainly, cynicism about politicians is nothing new. Thumbing through some issues of the New Yorker in its heyday, I found an article by Richard Rovere from June 1968 that described the intense dissatisfaction of voters with the presidential field at the time. What a field! Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, Eugene McCarthy, Richard Nixon, George Wallace and Nelson Rockefeller.

But what about Bob? I suspect that 14 months from now, at age 73, he'll be sworn in as president. He has a giant lead in New Hampshire. Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Tex.), who was supposed to give him a tough race, is in single digits. And his other top foes have never won an election—a reactionary pundit and a rich supply-sider who inherited a magazine from his famous dad.

In the general election, polls show Dole and President Clinton about even. But answers to two questions are ominous for the president. A Time/CNN survey found 41 percent would "definitely" vote against him. A Post survey asked, "Which party better represents your views on national issues." Republicans got 55 percent, Democrats 25 percent.

The White House, meanwhile, has adopted a weird reelection strategy. Harold Ickes, the lead official on the campaign, says that "the overall issue is going to be leadership. . . . People will make their judgments based

on what they know about the person, what they think about his character."

Bill Clinton running on character? Certainly, the lesson of the Powell infatuation is that the nation desperately wants a leader, but it's hard to see the current president as that man—or Dole, right now. Still, if you look beyond the next few messy weeks (in which Speaker Newt Gingrich, far more than Dole, is taking the heat on the budget), you can catch a glimpse of Dole's own story emerging. It is a powerful one, and most Americans don't know it yet.

I didn't know it myself until I read "What It Takes," Richard Ben Cramer's brilliant but unwieldy book on the 1988 presidential campaign. Now Cramer has collated all the bits about Dole and put them into a single volume, "Bob Dole," recently out in paperback from Vintage.

The story is the wound, suffered 50 years ago when, as a 21-year-old Army lieutenant, Dole's upper body was torn apart by German gunfire on a hill in Italy. "Whatever hit Dole had ripped into everything," writes Cramer, "You could see into Dole through the jacket, through the shoulder, like a gouged fruit.

See down to the core." Dole was sent back home, nearly died a few times, but hung on, fighting against what Cramer calls "his private vision of hell. . . . Sometimes, he could actually see himself on Main Street, Russell, in a wheelchair, with a cup."

In 1947, a Chicago surgeon named Hampar Kelikian, an Armenian immigrant who had come to America with \$20 in his pocket, put Dole back together. Dr. K. refused to be paid, but Dole had to get to Chicago, and the folks in Russell chipped in, putting their dollar bills in a cigar box.

Three years later, Dole was elected to the Kansas state house, then county attorney, then U.S. representative, then, in 1968, U.S. senator; in 1976, vice presidential nominee; in 1984, majority leader; in 1994, leader again.

The trouble with this great American success story is that Dole himself is reluctant to tell it. As Cramer shows, he feels embarrassed about not being "whole"—as if his handicap should be hidden:

"If [Dole] ever let himself rest, that [right] arm would hang straight down, visibly shorter than his left arm, with the palm of his right hand twisted toward the back. But

Dole never, lets anybody see that—his 'problem.' He keep a plastic pen in his crooked right fist to round its shape.

"If he ever let that pen go, the hand would splay, with the forefinger pointing and the others cramped in toward the palm. . . . No matter how that fist aches or spasms, Dole holds on—against his problem."

So what about Bob? He has few core beliefs, other than balancing the budget (as Cramer writes: "Bobby Joe Dole grew up in Russell, Kansas. He saw people die from debt."). He may be uncomfortable with Gingrich and his passionate conservative cohorts, but that doesn't mean he'll betray them. As president, he'll be a moderating force, but in the end, he'll sign, not veto.

Up to now, he's been ignored and underestimated. That's starting to change. Dole has to get through the Florida straw poll later this week with a good showing and get through the fight over the budget without serious damage. Then, it will be time to tell his story and show his stuff. Will Americans take to him as leader, as the last member of the heroic World War II generation to lead this country? Don't bet against it.